

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of August 4, 2009. All of the rejections are respectfully traversed. Claims **44-78** are currently pending. Claims **44** is currently amended. Amendment, reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action

In the Office Action mailed August 4, 2009:

claims 44-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reddy (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0227643) in view of Kato (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0036909).

The Present Application

By way of a brief review, the present disclosure is related to a public access multimedia communications hub that can offer services in public spaces [0021], [0047]. The hub utilizes a security/authentication system for users [0022]. One advantage of the hub is a lockable printing feature [0024]. Print jobs are held on a storage medium until a user-provided code is entered [0024], [0049]. Alternatively, print output can be held in an assigned, secure output region until a user's arrival and identification is confirmed [0024], [0050]. The hub is preferably a fee-for-service multifunction kiosk, which includes print/scan/copy/storage/faxing capabilities [0031], [0033] and payment acceptance modules for access to such capabilities [0040]. Furthermore, the hub is capable of receiving data (for production of hard-copies) [0027] from and transmitting data to portable electronic devices in communication with the hub [0028] or to other electronic destinations. The hub is capable of accepting hard copy data for reproduction [0029]. Audio feedback devices can be employed for telecommunication purposes [0030]. A controller is in communication with at least one data and audio ports, a telephone module, a UI element (for audio file creation), user authenticator modules [0035], voice command modules [0036], dictation modules [0036], video input ports, cameras and video handling modules (for tele- and videoconferencing, video file creation, etc.) [0037], storage data drives [0039], optical media drives [0046], and other

collaboration software that permits users an ability to connect and collaborate with personal electronic devices [0042], s.a., e.g., laptops, PDAs, mobiles, etc [0046]. A display interacts with users to display requested data [0041].

The preferred hub includes a chassis of at least one tower that houses engines, the controller, the display(s), storage devices, and ports [0043]. Navigation of a network is available through spoken command [0045] and various input devices [0049].

In operation, motion and/or pressure sensors sense approaching users, thus causing an wireless inquiry to the user's personal electronic device for identification verification [0049]. Other authentication modules can alternatively be employed [0049].

The Cited References

Reddy (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0227643)

Reddy is directed toward a system that provides interconnection of document processing devices to a network [0010]. The Reddy reference is related to a connection made between a document processing device and a token (i.e., a computer) by an interface, i.e., a communication link. The crux of the Reddy disclosure is directed toward the interface, which is a hand-held device [0058]-[0059] that functions as a router [0066]. The interface determines which port is available for network communication with a host computer [0044]. The interface can essentially be received in a port of a copier or similar document device, where it collects and manages information related to that copier for transmission to the host [0035], [0058]-[0059]. The interface performs tracking of projects, which can be stored for later collection, identifies users, identifies tokens (i.e., hand-held computers), and payment processing and information, etc. [0060]. The interface functions to connect copier and other document devices to a network [0068]. Users are then charged per byte of usage [0067].

An attached interface device terminal, including a display connected thereto, displays a list of alternate copiers available if the document handling device is being used [0091]. This terminal also receives codes entered there into for tracking departmental/financial/etc. projects [0070]. In summary, the interface is a means to bring a document handling device in network communication with a host. This interface identifies a set of signals to be used with the document processing device based upon

information in an identification circuit associated with the device [0038]. The interface identifies the device it connects to [0038] for tracking information related to the copier output, etc.

Kato (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0036909)

Kato introduces the problem of conveyance of complicated instructions and selections on a traditionally sophisticated display on a multi-function peripheral (hereinafter "multi function machine") [0002]-[0008]. Kato is directed toward an interfacing of a multi function machine for receiving voice input and audio feedback [0009] while still capable of tracking a current position in a layered menu of multiple layers [0010]. The interface includes a tree menu structure that generates separate (layered) menus for each document handling function [0034]. The multi function machine includes a jack for receipt of a headset having a microphone and earphones [0066]. Receipt of that headset in the jack causes the function control to switch modes [0066] to one that utilizes voice recognition and voice synthesis for selection of document handling features. A sound icon, associated with operational items, outputs to the headset when the position is moved to new operational items [0055]. The control unit activates the audio output unit to notify the user by a sound icon or a voice message of a confirmed operation [0070]. The function control unit observes a status of the multi function machine during handling, and it notifies the operator by outputting a sound icon or a voice feedback message of the status [0071]. In other embodiments, the control unit is incorporated in a computer [0073].

The Claims are Not Obvious

Claims 44-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reddy (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0227643) in view of Kato (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0036909). Figure 4 of the present disclosure illustrates the multimedia hub of the present disclosure, which is multimedia and services hub made available for public access in public spaces [0021], [0047]. The hub is described in the specification to preferably be a fee-for-service multifunction kiosk, which includes print/scan/copy/storage/faxing

capabilities [0031], [0033]. A kiosk is defined in the art as a small structure, often open on one or more sides, used as a booth. Kiosks were generally introduced as small structures on sidewalks that sold items such as newspapers or candy. The kiosk of the present disclosure follows the concept, wherein the small structure is employed in a common area of public spaces, such as, for example, a transportation terminal [0009] for public access to electronic/document handling and printing services. Applicants first replace the term "chassis" in the independent claim with the term "kiosk", and further add the limitation that such kiosk is situated in a public space.

The Examiner cites Figure 1 and paragraph [0032] of Reddy for providing the chassis/kiosk limitation including a structure of two towers. The document processing device of Reddy includes any device that produces, reproduces, or transfers information from one media to another [0024]. This device is connected to a host/computer server in a computer network [0032]. The Reddy disclosure is more specifically directed toward a compatible interface that connects the document handling device to the network by determining the signals for interfacing with the device [0034]-[0035]. The interface is a router that can essentially route information from the host to the document handling device, wherein the interface can furthermore track the communications and other information between the host and the document handling device.

In the present disclosure, the kiosk is described to perform document handling/receiving/transferring functions that are known to document handling devices; however, the kiosk is not the document handling device situated in home work spaces and offices, etc. Public access to the multiple conferencing, production and finishing services are made available in common areas of public spaces through situating the kiosk in such spaces. The kiosk either supports or houses the various displays and devices utilized in achieving the services. This kiosk feature is not provided in either of the prior art references cited in the combination. This feature includes two towers which stand from the floor.

Accordingly, Applicant amends the application to include a limitation that directs the kiosk for (i) providing access to services in common areas of public spaces and (ii) operatively interacting with personal electronic devices for providing conferencing, production, and finishing services in a public environment removed from the home.

There is no suggestion in either of the combined references directed toward a kiosk structure, including support towers, that is placed in a public environment for services generally completed in a non-public/office environment. This "booth"-like feature situated in public paths is novel as it is not discussed in the references.

MPEP section 2114 states that apparatus claims must be structurally distinguishable from the prior art, wherein the apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function (see also *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The section further reads that a prior art device can perform all of the functions of the apparatus claim and still not anticipate the claim. MPEP 2114. The prior art cannot anticipate the claim if there is *any* structural difference. The present claims incorporate the kiosk and tower limitations of claim 1.

Accordingly, dependent **claims 45-78** all incorporate the limitations amended herein, and they are allowable for at least the reasons set forth for independent **claim 44**.

Telephone Interview

In the interests of advancing this application to issue, the Applicant(s) respectfully request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned to discuss the foregoing or any suggestions that the Examiner may have to place the case in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all remaining claims (Claims 44-78) are now in condition for allowance. An early indication to that effect is therefore earnestly solicited.

Remaining Claims, as delineated below:

(1) FOR	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT LESS HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	(3) NUMBER EXTRA
TOTAL CLAIMS	35	- 106 = 0
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS	1	- 3 = 0

This is an authorization under 37 CFR 1.136(a)(3) to treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for extension of time, as incorporating a petition for the appropriate extension of time.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any filing or prosecution fees which may be required, under 37 CFR 1.16, 1.17, and 1.21 (but not 1.18), or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 24-0037.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP


Patrick R. Roche, Reg. No. 29,580
Mandy B. Seuffert, Reg. No. 57,879
The Halle Building – Fifth Floor
1228 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44115
216-363-9000

Date